

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK <http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk>  
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA <http://www.cup.org>  
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia  
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain

© 2000 Cambridge University Press

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2000

Printed in the United States of America

*Typeface* New Aster 9.75/13.5 pt. *System* QuarkXPress™ [HT]

*A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library*


*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available*

ISBN 0 521 59447 2 hardback  
ISBN 0 521 59460 X paperback

## Contents

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page vii</i>
PART ONE. INTRODUCTION	
<b>1 Writing an Empirical Article</b>	<b>3</b>
Daryl J. Bem	
<b>2 Writing a Literature Review</b>	<b>17</b>
Nancy Eisenberg	
PART TWO. PARTS OF AN ARTICLE	
<b>3 Titles and Abstracts: They Only Sound Unimportant</b>	<b>37</b>
Robert J. Sternberg	
<b>4 Introducing Your Research Report:</b>	
<b>Writing the Introduction</b>	<b>41</b>
Philip C. Kendall, Jennifer S. Silk, and Brian C. Chu	
<b>5 Theories and Hypotheses</b>	<b>58</b>
Abraham Tesser	
<b>6 Writing Effectively about Design</b>	<b>81</b>
Harry T. Reis	
<b>7 Doing Data Analyses and Writing Up Their Results:</b>	
<b>Selected Tricks and Artifices</b>	<b>98</b>
Elena L. Grigorenko	
<b>8 Results That Get Results: Telling a Good Story</b>	<b>121</b>
Peter Salovey	

<b>9 What Does It All Mean? The Discussion</b>	133
Robert Calfee	
<b>10 Documenting Your Scholarship: Citations and References</b>	146
Randolph A. Smith	
PART THREE. DEALING WITH REFEREES	
<b>11 Writing for Your Referees</b>	161
Robert J. Sternberg	
<b>12 Reading Reviews, Suffering Rejection, and Advocating for Your Paper</b>	169
Melissa G. Warren	
<b>13 Rewriting the Psychology Paper</b>	187
Richard K. Wagner	
PART FOUR. CONCLUSION	
<b>14 Article Writing 101: A Crib Sheet of 50 Tips for the Final Exam</b>	199
Robert J. Sternberg	




**F**or psychologists who pursue a career in scholarship, there is one more certainty beyond death and taxes: rejected articles. Strongly refereed journals have high rejection rates and so it is almost inevitable that, sooner or later, usually sooner, one will get an editor's letter rejecting a submitted article. Even most articles that ultimately are accepted first were rejected. In some cases, the editor gave the author a chance to resubmit. In other cases, the author simply submitted the article to another journal. In either case, the article was rejected before it was accepted.

Outright acceptances are quite rare. When I was editor of the *Psychological Bulletin*, for example, our outright acceptance rate for initial submissions was probably about 2%.

The goal of this book is to offer authors guidance in how to write better articles and thereby improve their chances for acceptance. The book is divided into 14 chapters, including a final integrative chapter, with each of the first 13 chapters covering a different aspect of the article-writing process, including writing an empirical article, writing a literature review, titles and abstracts, introductions, theories and hypotheses, experimental design, data analysis, results, discussions, citations and references, writing for reviewers, reading reviews, and methods.

A unique feature of this book is that all chapter authors have been editors or associate editors of major psychological journals, so that they are in a good position to write about writing articles. In writing their chapters for this book, all of these authors have written for

## Chapter 1



**Y**ou have conducted a study and analyzed the data. Now it is time to write. To publish. To tell the world what you have learned. The purpose of this book is to enhance the chances that some journal editor will let you do so.

If you are new to this enterprise, you might find it helpful to consult two additional sources of information. For detailed information on the proper format of a journal article, see the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA, 1994) and recent articles in the particular journal to which you plan to submit your manuscript. The *Publication Manual* also devotes 15 pages each to two topics that are not discussed in this chapter: the rules of English grammar and the appropriate terms to use when referring to gender, ethnicity, or sexual orientation. For renewing your acquaintance with the stylistic elements of English prose, you can read Chapter 2 of the *Publication Manual* or any one of several style manuals. I recommend *The Elements of Style* by Strunk and White (1999). It is brief, witty, and inexpensive.

As noted in the Preface, this book focuses on the report of an empirical study, but the general writing suggestions included in this chapter apply as well to the theoretical articles, literature reviews, and methodological contributions that also appear in the professional journals.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Some of the material in this chapter has been adapted from Bem (1987, 1995).

## PLANNING IT

### Which Article Should You Write?

There are two possible articles you can write: (a) the article you planned to write when you designed your study or (b) the article that makes the most sense now that you have seen the results. They are rarely the same, and the correct answer is (b).

The conventional view of the research process is that we first derive a set of hypotheses from a theory, design and conduct a study to test these hypotheses, analyze the data to see if they were confirmed or disconfirmed, and then chronicle this sequence of events in the journal article. If this is how our enterprise actually proceeded, we could write most of the article before we collected the data. We could write the introduction and method sections completely, prepare the results section in skeleton form, leaving spaces to be filled in by the specific numerical results, and have two possible discussion sections ready to go, one for positive results, the other for negative results.

But this is not how our enterprise actually proceeds. Psychology is more exciting than that, and the best journal articles are informed by the actual empirical findings from the opening sentence. Accordingly, before writing your article, you need to *analyze your data*. Herewith, a brief sermonette on the topic.

**Analyzing Your Data.** Once upon a time, psychologists observed behavior directly, often for sustained periods of time. No longer. Now, the higher the investigator goes up the tenure ladder, the more remote he or she typically becomes from the grounding observations of our science. If you are already a successful research psychologist, then you probably haven't seen a live human participant for some time. Your graduate assistant assigns the running of a study to a bright undergraduate who writes the computer program that collects the data automatically. And like the modern dentist, the modern psychologist rarely even sees the data until they have been cleaned by human or computer hygienists.

To compensate for this remoteness from our participants, let us at least become intimately familiar with the record of their behavior: the data. Examine them from every angle. Analyze the sexes separately. Make up new composite indices. If a datum suggests a new hypothesis, try to find further evidence for it elsewhere in the

data. If you see dim traces of interesting patterns, try to reorganize the data to bring them into bolder relief. If there are participants you don't like, or trials, observers, or interviewers who gave you anomalous results, place them aside temporarily and see if any coherent patterns emerge. Go on a fishing expedition for something – anything – interesting.

No, this is not immoral. In fact, there are now textbooks and computer packages explicitly designed for this kind of exploratory data analysis. The rules of scientific and statistical inference that we overlearn in graduate school apply to the "Context of Justification." They tell us what we can legitimately conclude in the articles we write for public consumption, and they give our readers criteria for deciding whether or not to believe us. But in the "Context of Discovery," there are no formal rules, only heuristics or strategies. How does one discover a new phenomenon? Smell a good idea? Have a brilliant insight into behavior? Create a new theory? In the confining context of an empirical study, there is only one strategy for discovery: exploring the data.

Yes, there is a danger. Spurious findings can emerge by chance, and we need to be cautious about anything we discover in this way. In limited cases, there are statistical techniques that correct for this danger. But there are no statistical correctives for overlooking an important discovery because we were insufficiently attentive to the data. Let us err on the side of discovery.

**Reporting the Findings.** When you are through exploring, you may conclude that the data are not strong enough to justify your new insights formally, but at least you are now ready to design the "right" study. If you still plan to report the current data, you may wish to mention the new insights tentatively, stating honestly that they remain to be tested adequately. Alternatively, the data may be strong enough and reliable enough to justify recentering your article around the new findings and subordinating or even ignoring your original hypotheses.

This is *not* advice to suppress negative results. If your study was genuinely designed to test hypotheses that derive from a theory or are of wide general interest for some other reason, then they should remain the focus of your article. The integrity of the scientific enterprise requires the reporting of disconfirming results – even if only to warn other researchers about pursuing the same fruitless path.

But this requirement assumes that somebody out there cares about the hypotheses. Many respectable studies are explicitly exploratory or are launched from speculations of the “I-wonder-if . . .” variety. If your study is one of these, then nobody cares if you were wrong. Contrary to the conventional wisdom, science does not care how clever or clairvoyant you were at guessing your results ahead of time. Scientific integrity does not require you to lead your readers through all your wrongheaded hunches only to show – voila! – they were wrongheaded. A journal article should not be a personal history of your stillborn thoughts.

Your overriding purpose is to tell the world what you have learned from your study. If your results suggest a compelling framework for their presentation, adopt it and make the most instructive findings your centerpiece. Think of your data as a jewel. Your task is to cut and polish it, to select the facets to highlight, and to craft the best setting for it. Many experienced authors write the results section first because it can serve as the outline for the overall story of the article.

But before writing anything, analyze your data!

End of sermonette.

### For Whom Should You Write?

Scientific journals are published for specialized audiences who share a common background of substantive knowledge and methodological expertise. If you wish to write well, you should ignore this fact. Psychology encompasses a broader range of subjects and methodologies than do most other disciplines, and its findings are frequently of interest to a wider public. The social psychologist should be able to read a *Psychometrika* article on logistic regression; the personality theorist, a *Science* article on hypothalamic function; and the congressional aide with a BA in history, a *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* article on attribution theory.

Accordingly, good writing is good teaching. Direct your writing to the student in Psychology 101, your colleague in the Art History Department, and your grandmother. No matter how technical or abstruse your article is in its particulars, intelligent nonpsychologists with no expertise in statistics or experimental design should be able to comprehend the broad outlines of what you did and why. They should understand in general terms what was learned. And above all, they should appreciate why someone – anyone – should give a damn.

The introduction and discussion sections in particular should be accessible to this wider audience.

The actual technical materials – those found primarily in the method and results sections – should be aimed at a reader one level of expertise less specialized than the audience for which the journal is primarily published. Assume that the reader of your article in *Psychometrika* knows about regression, but needs some introduction to logistic regression. Assume that the reader of the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* knows about person perception but needs some introduction to dispositional and situational attributions.

Many of the writing techniques suggested in this chapter are thus teaching techniques designed to make your article comprehensible to the widest possible audience. They are also designed to remain invisible or transparent to your readers, thereby infusing your prose with a “subliminal pedagogy.” Good writing is good teaching.

### WRITING IT

The primary criteria for good scientific writing are accuracy and clarity. If your article is interesting and written with style, fine. But these are subsidiary virtues. First strive for accuracy and clarity.

The first step toward clarity is to write simply and directly. A journal article tells a straightforward tale of a circumscribed problem in search of an answer. It is not a novel with subplots and flashbacks but a short story with a single, linear narrative line. Let this line stand out in bold relief. Clear any underbrush that entangles your prose by obeying Strunk and White's (1979) famous dictum, “omit needless words,” and by extending the dictum to needless concepts, topics, anecdotes, asides, and footnotes. If a point seems tangential to your basic argument, remove it. If you can't bring yourself to do this, put it in a footnote. Then, when you revise your manuscript, remove the footnote. In short, don't make your voice struggle to be heard above the ambient noise of cluttered writing. Let your 90th percentile verbal aptitude nourish your prose, not glut it. Write simply and directly.

The second step toward clarity is good organization, and the standardized format of a journal article does much of the work for you. It not only permits readers to read the report from beginning to end, as

they would any coherent narrative, but also to scan it for a quick overview of the study or to locate specific information easily by turning directly to the relevant section. Within that format, however, it is still helpful to work from an outline of your own. This enables you to examine the logic of the sequence, spot important points that are omitted or misplaced, and decide how best to divide the narrative between the introduction and final discussion.

An article is written in the shape of an hourglass. It begins with broad general statements, progressively narrows down to the specifics of your study, and then broadens out again to more general considerations. Thus:

*The introduction begins broadly:* "Individuals differ radically from one another in the degree to which they are willing and able to express their emotions."

*It becomes more specific:* "Indeed, the popular view is that such emotional expressiveness is a central difference between men and women. . . . But the research evidence is mixed..."

*And more so:* "There is even some evidence that men may actually..."

*Until you are ready to introduce your own study in conceptual terms:* "In this study, we recorded the emotional reactions of both men and women to filmed..."

*The method and results sections are the most specific, the "neck" of the hourglass:* [Method] "One hundred male and 100 female undergraduates were shown one of two movies..."

[Results] "Table 1 shows that men in the father-watching condition cried significantly more..."

*The discussion section begins with the implications of your study:* "These results imply that sex differences in emotional expressiveness are moderated by two kinds of variables..."

*It becomes broader:* "Not since Charles Darwin's first observations has psychology contributed as much new..."

*And more so:* "If emotions can incarcerate us by hiding our complexity, at least their expression can liberate us by displaying our authenticity."

This closing statement might be a bit grandiose for some journals – I'm not even sure what it means – but if your study is carefully executed and conservatively interpreted, most editors will permit you to indulge yourself a bit at the two broad ends of the hourglass. Being dull only appears to be a prerequisite for publishing in the professional journals.

## REWRITING IT

For many writers revising a manuscript is unmitigated agony. Even proofreading is painful. And so they don't. So relieved to get a draft done, they run it through the spell checker – some don't even do that – and then send it off to the journal, thinking that they can clean up the writing after the article has been accepted. Alas, that day rarely comes. Some may find solace in the belief that the manuscript probably would have been rejected even if it had been extensively revised and polished; after all, most APA journals accept only 15–20% of all manuscripts submitted. But from my own experience as an editor of an APA journal, I believe that the difference between the articles accepted and the top 15–20% of those rejected is frequently the difference between good and less good writing. Moral: Don't expect journal reviewers to discern your brilliance through the smog of polluted writing. Revise your manuscript. Polish it. Proofread it. Then submit it.

Rewriting is difficult for several reasons. First, it is difficult to edit your own writing. You will not notice ambiguities and explanatory gaps because *you* know what you meant to say and *you* understand the omitted steps. One strategy for overcoming this difficulty is to lay your manuscript aside for awhile and then return to it later when it has become less familiar. Sometimes it helps to read it aloud. But there is no substitute for practicing the art of taking the role of the nonspecialist reader, for learning to role-play grandma. As you read, ask yourself, "Have I been told yet what this concept means?" "Has the logic of this step been demonstrated?" "Would I know what the independent variable is at this point?" This is precisely the skill of the good lecturer in Psychology 101: the ability to anticipate the audience's level of understanding at each point in the presentation. Good writing is good teaching.



But because this is not easy, you should probably give a copy of a fairly polished manuscript to a friend or colleague for a critical reading. If you get critiques from several colleagues, you will have simulated the journal's review process. The best readers are those who have themselves had articles published in psychological journals but who are unfamiliar with the subject of your manuscript.

If your colleagues find something unclear, do not argue with them. They are right: By definition, the writing is unclear. Their suggestions for correcting the unclarity may be wrongheaded; but as unclarity detectors, readers are never wrong. Also resist the temptation simply to clarify their confusion verbally. Your colleagues don't want to offend you or appear stupid, so they simply mumble "oh yes, of course, of course" and apologize for not having read carefully enough. As a consequence, you are pacified, and your next readers, the journal's reviewers, will stumble over the same problem. They will not apologize; they will reject.

Rewriting is difficult for a second reason: It requires a high degree of compulsiveness and attention to detail. The probability of writing a sentence perfectly the first time is vanishingly small, and good writers rewrite nearly every sentence of a manuscript in the course of polishing successive drafts. But even good writers differ from one another in their approach to the first draft. Some spend a long time carefully choosing each word and reshaping each sentence and paragraph as they go. Others pound out a rough draft quickly and then go back for extensive revision. Although I personally prefer the former method, I think it wastes time. Most writers should probably get the first draft done as quickly as possible without agonizing over stylistic niceties. Once it is done, however, compulsiveness and attention to detail become the required virtues.

Finally, rewriting is difficult because it usually means restructuring. Sometimes it is necessary to discard whole sections of a manuscript, add new ones, and then totally reorganize the manuscript just to iron out a bump in the logic of the argument. Don't get so attached to your first draft that you are unwilling to tear it apart and rebuild it. (This is why the strategy of crafting each sentence of a first draft wastes time. A beautiful turn of phrase that took me 20 minutes to shape gets discarded when I have to restructure the manuscript. Worse, I get so attached to the phrase that I resist restructuring until

I can find a new home for it.) A badly constructed building cannot be salvaged by brightening up the wallpaper. A badly constructed manuscript cannot be salvaged by changing words, inverting sentences, and shuffling paragraphs.

Which brings me to the word processor. Its very virtuosity at making these cosmetic changes will tempt you to tinker endlessly, encouraging you in the illusion that you are restructuring right there in front of the monitor. Do not be fooled. You are not. A word processor – even one with a fancy outline mode – is not an adequate restructuring tool for most writers. Moreover, it can produce flawless, physically beautiful drafts of wretched writing, encouraging you in the illusion that they are finished manuscripts ready to be submitted. Do not be fooled. They are not. If you are blessed with an excellent memory (or a very large monitor) and are confident that you can get away with a purely electronic process of restructuring, do it. But don't be ashamed to print out a complete draft of your manuscript; spread it out on table or floor; take pencil, scissors, and Scotch tape in hand; and then, all by your low-tech self, have at it.

If, after all this, your manuscript still seems interesting and you still believe the results and interpretation of your study, submit it.

## SOME MATTERS OF STYLE

### Metacomments

It is often helpful to give readers of an article an early overview of its structure and content. But beyond that, you should avoid making "metacomments" about the writing. Expository prose fails its mission if it diverts the reader's attention to itself and away from the topic; the process of writing should be invisible to the reader. In particular, the prose itself should direct the flow of the narrative without requiring you to play tour guide. Don't say, "Now that the three theories of emotion have been discussed, we can turn to the empirical work on each of them. We begin with the psychoanalytic account of affect. . . ." Instead, move directly from your discussion of the theories into the review of the evidence with a simple transition sentence such as, "Each of these three theories has been tested empirically. Thus, the psychoanalytic account of affect has received support in studies that. . . ." In the results

section, don't say: "Now that we have seen the results for negative affect, we are in a position to examine men's and women's emotional expression in the realm of positive affect. The relevant data are presented in Table 2 . . ." Instead use a transition sentence that simultaneously summarizes and moves the story along: "Men may thus be more expressive than women in the domain of negative emotion, but are they also more expressive in the domain of positive emotion? Table 2 shows that they are not . . ." Any other guideposts needed can be supplied by using informative headings and by following the advice on repetition and parallel construction given in the next section.

If you feel the need to make metacomments to keep the reader on the narrative path, then your plot line is probably already too cluttered or pretzel shaped, the writing insufficiently linear. Metacomments only oppress the prose further. Instead, copyedit. Omit needless words, don't add them.

### **Repetition and Parallel Construction**

Inexperienced writers often substitute synonyms for recurring words and vary their sentence structure in the mistaken belief that this is more creative and interesting. Instead of using repetition and parallel construction, as in "women may be more expressive than men in the domain of positive emotion, but they are not more expressive in the domain of negative emotion," they attempt to be more creative: "Women may be more expressive than men in the domain of positive emotion, but it is not the case that they are more prone than the opposite sex to display the less cheerful affects."

Such creativity is hardly more interesting, but it is certainly more confusing. In scientific communication, it can be deadly. When an author uses different words to refer to the same concept in a technical article – where accuracy is paramount – readers justifiably wonder if different meanings are implied. The example in the preceding paragraph is not disastrous, and most readers will be unaware that their understanding flickered momentarily when the prose hit a bump. But consider the cognitive burden carried by readers who must hack through this "creative" jungle:

The low-dissonance participants were paid a large sum of money while not being given a free choice of whether or not to participate, whereas the indi-

viduals we randomly assigned to the small-incentive treatment (the high-dissonance condition) were offered the opportunity to refuse.

This (fictitious) writer should have written,

Low-dissonance individuals were paid a large sum of money and were required to participate; high-dissonance individuals were paid a small sum of money and were not required to participate.

The wording and grammatical structure of the two clauses are held rigidly parallel; only the variables vary. Repetition and parallel construction are among the most effective servants of clarity. Don't be creative; be clear.

Repetition and parallel construction also serve clarity at a larger level of organization. By providing the reader with distinctive guideposts to the structure of the prose, they can diminish or eliminate the need for metacomments on the writing. Here, for example, are the opening sentences from three of the paragraphs in the previous section on rewriting:

2nd paragraph: "Rewriting is difficult for several reasons. First . . ."

5th paragraph: "Rewriting is difficult for a second reason."

6th paragraph: "And finally, rewriting is difficult because it . . ."

If I had substituted synonyms for the recurring words or varied the grammatical structure of these opening sentences, their guiding function would have been lost, the reader's sense of the section's organization blurred. (I try so hard to be helpful and I bet you didn't even notice. That, of course, is the point.)

And finally, repetition and parallel construction can serve style and creativity as well as clarity. For example, they can establish metaphor: "A badly constructed building cannot be salvaged by brightening up the wallpaper. A badly constructed article cannot be salvaged by changing words, inverting sentences, and shuffling paragraphs." And, they can add humor: "The word processor encourages you in the illusion that you are restructuring. Do not be fooled. You are not. The word processor encourages you in the illusion that your drafts are finished manuscripts. Do not be fooled. They are not."



### Jargon and Technical Terms

The specialized terminology of a discipline is called jargon, and it serves a number of legitimate functions in scientific communication. A specialized term may be more general, more precise, or freer of surplus meaning than any natural language equivalent (e.g., the term *disposition* encompasses, and hence is more general than, beliefs, attitudes, moods, and personality attributes; *reinforcement* is more precise and freer of surplus meaning than *reward*). Also, the technical vocabulary often makes an important conceptual distinction not apprehended in the layperson's lexicon (e.g., genotype vs. phenotype).

But if a jargon term does not satisfy any of these criteria, opt for English. Much of our jargon has become second nature to us and serves only to muddy our prose. (As an editor, I once had to interrogate an author at length to learn that a prison program for "strengthening the executive functions of the ego" actually taught prisoners how to fill out job applications.) And unless the jargon term is extremely well known (e.g., reinforcement), it should be defined – explicitly, implicitly, or by context and example – the first time it is introduced.

For example, in an article on ESP, a coauthor and I decided that we could not proceed beyond the opening paragraph until we had first explicitly defined and clarified the unfamiliar but central theoretical term:

The term *psi* denotes anomalous processes of information or energy transfer, processes such as telepathy or other forms of extrasensory perception that are currently unexplained in terms of known physical or biological mechanisms. The term is purely descriptive: It neither implies that such anomalous phenomena are paranormal nor connotes anything about their underlying mechanisms. (Bem & Honorton, 1994, p. 4)

Here is how one might define a technical term (ego control) and identify its conceptual status (a personality variable) more implicitly:

The need to delay gratification, control impulses, and modulate emotional expression is the earliest and most ubiquitous demand that society places upon the developing child. Because success at so many of life's tasks depends critically on the individual's mastery of such ego control, evidence for life-course continuities in this central personality domain should be readily obtained.

And finally, here is a (made-up) example in which the technical terms are defined only by the context. Note, however, that the technical abbreviation, MAO, is still identified explicitly when it is first introduced.

In the continuing search for the biological correlates of psychiatric disorder, blood platelets are now a prime target of investigation. In particular, reduced monoamine oxidase (MAO) activity in the platelets is sometimes correlated with paranoid symptomatology, auditory hallucinations or delusions in chronic schizophrenia, and a tendency toward psychopathology in normal men. Unfortunately, these observations have not always replicated, casting doubt on the hypothesis that MAO activity is, in fact, a biological marker in psychiatric disorder. Even the general utility of the platelet model as a key to central nervous system abnormalities in schizophrenia remains controversial. The present study attempts to clarify the relation of MAO activity to symptomatology in chronic schizophrenia.

This kind of writing would not appear in *Newsweek*, and yet it is still accessible to a nonspecialist who may never even have heard of blood platelets, MAO activity, or biological markers. The structure of the writing itself adequately defines the relationships among these things and provides enough context to make the basic rationale behind the study comprehensible. At the same time, this introduction is neither condescending nor boring to the technically sophisticated reader. The pedagogy that makes it accessible to the nonspecialist is not only invisible to the specialist but also enhances the clarity of the article for both readers.

### Voice and Self-Reference

In the past, scientific writers used the passive voice almost exclusively and referred to themselves in the third person: "This experiment was designed by the investigators to test . . ." This practice produces lifeless prose and is no longer the norm. Use the active voice unless style or content dictates otherwise, and, in general, keep self-reference to a minimum. Remember that you are not the subject of your article. You should not refer to yourself as "the author" or "the investigator." (You may refer to "the experimenter" in the method section, however, even if that happens to be you; the experimenter is part of the subject under discussion there.) You may use the pronoun *we*

to refer to yourself and your coauthors, but not to yourself as sole author. In that case, you may refer to yourself as "I", but do so sparingly. It tends to distract the reader from the topic, and it is better to remain in the background. The *Publication Manual* also advises avoiding the use of *we* in broader ways that leave readers uncertain to whom it refers. For example, the sentence beginning with "We usually classify bird song . . ." should be changed to "Researchers usually classify bird song . . ."

Finally, you should leave the reader in the background, too. Don't say, "The reader will find it hard to believe that . . ." or "You will be surprised to learn . . ." (This chapter violates the rule because you and your writing are the subject.) You may, however, occasionally refer to the reader indirectly in imperative, "you-understood" sentences: "Consider, first, the results for women."

## BEYOND PUBLICATION

In this book, we have presumed that your pressing pragmatic purpose is to transform your studies into publishable – nay, published – prose. But let your grander goal be to gift that prose with the effortless grace and supple simplicity of a Mozart sonata. This guiding metaphor may not turn all your studies into publications – even Mozart died a pauper – but it will turn even your sow's ears into vinyl purses.

## REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association. (1994). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Bem, D. J. (1987). Writing the empirical journal article. In M. P. Zanna & J. M. Darley (Eds.), *The compleat academic: A practical guide for the beginning social scientist* (pp. 171–201). New York: Random House.
- Bem, D. J. (1995). Writing a review article for *Psychological Bulletin*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118, 172–177.
- Bem, D. J., & Honorton, C. (1994). Does psi exist? Replicable evidence for an anomalous process of information transfer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115, 4–18.
- Strunk, W., Jr., & White, E. B. (1999). *The elements of style* (4th ed.). New York: Simon & Schuster.

## Chapter 2

### Writing a Literature Review

NANCY EISENBERG

**W**riting a literature review requires a somewhat different set of skills than writing an empirical research article. Indeed, some people who are very good at writing empirical research reports are not skilled at composing review papers. What are the characteristics that differentiate literature reviews that are likely to be published and make a difference from those that are difficult to publish and make a limited contribution?

I have been thinking about this topic quite a lot recently. As the current editor of *Psychological Bulletin*, the literature review journal of the American Psychological Association, I constantly deal with the issue of evaluating review papers. I had written a number of literature reviews myself prior to becoming editor; however, in the process of editing the journal I have had to consolidate what were vague, sometimes un verbalized cognitions regarding the properties of an excellent review into criteria for guiding editorial decisions.

Before writing this chapter, I started to outline my recommendations. As a last step before beginning to write, I read a similar paper written by Daryl Bem that was published in *Psychological Bulletin* in 1995. I was surprised at how similar Bem's and my ideas were; sometimes he even used the same words that I have used when talking about writing reviews to groups at conferences and to my students. Based on

Work on this chapter was supported by a grant from the National Institutes of Mental Health (1 R01 HH55052) and a Research Scientist Award from the National Institute of Mental Health (K05 M801321) to Nancy Eisenberg.